

whole community, and such a proposition would not represent the foreigners more than under the present system. Whenever a foreigner who was a popular man, desired to be a candidate, and to come to the Legislature—whenever he could get elected to the Legislature, he was sent as any other man would be. They did not look at his birth, but they looked at his merits and popularity.

The gentleman also said that this proposition to district Baltimore, had nothing to do with the rights of foreigners. They certainly would not so understand it.

The gentleman had thought proper to refer to an article in the Baltimore "Argus," which he said he understood had been written by a member of that Convention, and which gave a proper exposition of the principle of party organization. The gentleman seemed to imply that the article was written by himself, (Mr. B.) He was perfectly willing to avow the authorship of the extracts, and would state how they came to be published. He found in the city of Baltimore, as he supposed an attempt to misrepresent his position in this Convention.

He had always seen, in the Convention, a manifestation of party spirit, and an attempt to fasten that spirit upon the Constitution, although it might not have been so designed, and he, (Mr. B.) believed that it was party spirit which led to the proposition to connect National with State politics. He meant to place his situation before his constituents, firmly and boldly upon that subject, so that if there was to be a party spirit manifested in the Constitution the people of Baltimore might understand it. For this purpose he sent his own particular views to the organ of the party to which he belonged, and expressly stated that he did not write them for publication, and did not desire them to be published; but if the editor approved his views he could express them in his own language and in his own way. He was greatly surprised to find them inserted. He never concealed any thing. It was the second time he had had anything to do with publications in newspapers. One was when he felt at liberty to report the remarks of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) about the city of Baltimore—they not having any reporters at that time.

He disapproved of this thing, and had never done it but in these two solitary instances; once when he desired that the people of Baltimore should know what had been said about them, and again that his position in this Convention might be known by the party organ, and if approved, be sustained editorially, in order to guard against misrepresentation.

And now in regard to that article. The gentleman from Charles had not construed it properly. He did not take the position that Executive patronage must be retained in this Constitution. What he meant was this: that before party movements should be accomplished in the Constitution, such as connecting the Presidential election with the gubernatorial election for party purposes, that certain other requisites ought to be required in the Constitution.

The gentleman had asked if he, (Mr. B.) was opposed to bringing out a full vote at the Governor's election? Certainly not; he desired to see the fullest vote—but if that full vote was to be brought out, in order to bring national politics to bear upon State elections and State policy, he reprobated and condemned it.

He called upon gentlemen to read the article, and see whether there is in the whole article, any allusion to party considerations except to repel and counteract party spirit appearing in this Convention. He had always been willing to strip the executive of his important patronage, and desired to see the people have the right to secure a Convention, independent of legislative action hereafter.

He had only to say upon this question of representation, that while he did not regard it, the manner of its adjustment as a *sine qua non*, he would not vote for any compromise in the House of Delegates. If it passed without his vote, and if those other measures passed, securing the right of the people beyond legislative control, to periodical Conventions, reforming and re-organizing the judiciary, and keeping separate the election of Governor from national politics, he was prepared to vote for the Constitution, and to deprive the executive of all his important patronage. This was the position he laid down on the fifth February last.

His friend from Charles had mis-understood his vote on the Attorney General question. If the gentleman had ever heard his remarks or examined his votes, the record would show that he stated his position to be this: that he should vote to abolish the present tenure of office, and let the city of Baltimore and the counties elect their prosecuting attorneys, and to let the whole people elect by general ticket, an Attorney General whose salary should be limited, thus abolishing the present mode of tenure and appointment by the Governor; and he gave his votes with this object in view. He challenged any one to say that he had been inconsistent.

He voted against the proposition of the gentleman from Cecil to allow the Governor to employ counsel whenever it should be necessary, and to leave the compensation to the legislature, because he thought that the rate of compensation to be paid, should not be left to the legislature.

His friend from Charles had referred to having met him before the people at the July term of the Charles county court. He called upon him to say whether, at that term, (when he was merely nominated, but not elected to the Convention,) he did not there publicly proclaim, (being called out by his friend from Charles) that he should, as a delegate, if elected, vote for representation according to population in the House of Delegates; and that if any compromise was to be made, it should be made in the Senate; that although the people of Baltimore city, had given him no instructions, he intended to pursue this course?

Mr. JENIFER replied that he was very happy to have an opportunity of doing justice to the gentleman, and he had intended, in the remarks